Document 1

Filed 03/13/2008

Page 1 of 23

Case 3:08-cv-01439-WHA

same facts, are also brought under California law, including, but not limited to, violations of *California Health & Safety Code* § 19955, *et seq.*, including *California Code of Regulations*, Title 24, § 19959, *California Civil Code* §§ 51, 51.5, 52(a), 52.1, 54, 54.1, 54.3 and 55.

2. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 *USC* § 1391(b) and is founded on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action is located in this district, in Santa Maria, Santa Barbara County, California, and that Plaintiff's causes of action arose in this district.

## **INTRODUCTION**

- 3. The **BIG LOTS STORE** #4054 is located at 1417 S. Broadway, Santa Maria, California. Said store is owned and operated by defendants **BIG LOTS STORES, INC., PNS STORES, INC., MIDEB NOMINEES, INC., and DOES ONE TO TEN, inclusive**.
- 4. Defendants **BIG LOTS STORES, INC., PNS STORES, INC., MIDEB NOMINEES, INC., and DOES ONE TO TEN, inclusive,** operate an establishment for services to the public and at which Defendants failed to provide barrier free access to said establishment in conformity with both Federal and California legal requirements. Further, Defendants failed to provide compliance as follows:

### **Entrance**

1. There is no International Symbol of Accessibility signage at the entrance in violation of California Title 24 §1117B.5.8.1.2, ADAAG 4.30.7\*.

### **Inside Store**

- 2. The aisles inside the store are too narrow for wheelchairs in violation of California Title 24 §1133B.6.2, ADAAG 7.3\*(2).
- 3. There are no accessible checkout counters in violation of California Title 24 §1122B.4, ADAAG 4.3.1, 7.2(1)(2).

## Women's' Restroom

- 4. The restroom door handles are twist and turn in violation of California Title 24 §1133B.2.5.2, ADAAG 4.13.9\*.
- 5. There is not enough space to maneuver a wheelchair within the water closet for transfer to the toilet in violation of California Title 24 §1115B.7.(3), ADAAG 4.23.3\*.
- 6. The hot water pipes under the sink are not insulated or otherwise wrapped in violation of California Title 24 §1115B.2.1.2.2, ADAAG 4.19.4.
- 7. The mirror is mounted higher than the maximum allowable height in violation of California Title 24 §1115B.9.1(2), ADAAG 4.19.6\*.
- 8. The toilet tissue dispenser is too high in violation of California Title 24 §1115B.9.3, ADAAG 4.16.6.
- 9. There are no grab bars in the water closet in violation of California Title 24 §1115B.8.1, ADAAG 4.16.4, 4.26.1.
- 10. There is no accessible signage on the restroom door in violation of California Title 24 §1115B.5, ADAAG 4.30.7.
- 11. The paper towel dispenser is too high in violation of California Title 24 §1115B.9.2, ADAAG 4.23.7.

The above barriers interfered with Plaintiff's access and continue to deter Plaintiff from visiting said facilities, and as a legal result, Plaintiff **ANNA ESCOBEDO** suffers violation of her civil rights to full and equal enjoyment of goods, services, facilities and privileges, and has and will suffer embarrassment and humiliation.

## FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

5. Plaintiff **ANNA ESCOBEDO** is, and at all times relevant to this Complaint is, a "physically handicapped person, "physically disabled person," and a "person with a disability," as these terms are used under California law and under federal laws including, but not limited to, Title III of the *Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990*. (The terms

4

5

6

7 8

9 10

11

12

13

14

16

15

17 18

19 20

21

22 23

24 25

26

27

28

"physically handicapped person," "physically disabled person," and a "person with a disability" will be used interchangeably throughout this Complaint.) Plaintiff is a "person with a disability," as defined by all applicable California and United State's laws. Plaintiff **ANNA ESCOBEDO** is severely limited in the use of her legs.

- Defendants BIG LOTS STORES, INC., PNS STORES, INC., MIDEB 6. NOMINEES, INC., and DOES ONE TO TEN, inclusive, at all times relevant herein were and are the owners and operators; lessors and/or lessees, franchisers and/or franchisees, of public facilities known as the "BIG LOTS STORE #4054," located at Santa Maria, California, subject to the requirements of California state law requiring full and equal access to public facilities pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 19955, et seg., California Civil Code §§ 51, 51.5, 52(a), 52.1, 54, 54.1, 54.3 and 55, and subject to Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and to all other legal requirements referred to in this Complaint. Plaintiff does not know the relative responsibilities of defendants in the operation of the facilities herein complained of, and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such defendants.
- Defendants BIG LOTS STORES, INC., PNS STORES, INC., MIDEB 7. NOMINEES, INC., and DOES ONE TO TEN, inclusive (hereinafter alternatively referred to collectively as "defendants"), at all times relevant herein were and are owners, possessors, builders and keepers of the "BIG LOTS STORE #4054" in Santa Maria, California.
- 8. Defendants BIG LOTS STORES, INC., PNS STORES, INC., MIDEB NOMINEES, INC., and DOES ONE TO TEN, inclusive are the owners and operators of the subject "BIG LOTS STORE #4054" at all times relevant to this Complaint. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the defendants herein is the agent, employee or representative of each of the other defendants, and performed all acts and omissions stated herein within the scope of such agency or employment or representative capacity and is responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions of the other defendants in legally causing the damages complained of herein, and have approved or

4 5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

ratified each of the acts or omissions of each other defendant, as herein described.

- 9. Plaintiff ANNA ESCOBEDO does not know the true names and capacities of defendants BIG LOTS STORES, INC., PNS STORES, INC., MIDEB NOMINEES, INC., and DOES ONE TO TEN, inclusive, their business capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, nor their relative responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of, and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such defendants. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the defendants herein, including DOES ONE TO TEN, inclusive, is the agent, ostensible agent, master, servant, employer, employee, representative, franchiser, franchisee, joint venturer, partner, and associate, or such similar capacity, of each of the other defendants, and was at all times acting and performing, or failing to act or perform, with the authorization, consent, permission or ratification of each of the other defendants, and is responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions of the other defendants in legally causing the violations and damages complained of herein, and have approved or ratified each of the acts or omissions of each other defendant, as herein described. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend this Complaint when the true names, capacities, connections and responsibilities of defendants BIG LOTS STORES, INC., PNS STORES, INC., MIDEB NOMINEES, INC., and DOES ONE TO TEN, inclusive, are ascertained.
- 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes that all named defendants, including DOES ONE TO TEN, inclusive, conspired to commit the acts described herein, or alternatively, aided and abetted one another in the performance of the wrongful acts hereinafter alleged.
- 11. Defendants **BIG LOTS STORES**, **INC.**, **PNS STORES**, **INC.**, **MIDEB NOMINEES**, **INC.**, **and DOES ONE TO TEN**, **inclusive**, are the owners and operators of "**BIG LOTS STORE** #4054," located at Santa Maria, California. This store, including, but not limited to, parking spaces and access aisles and access routes, are each a part of a "public accommodation or facility" subject to the requirements of *California Health & Safety Code* § 19955, *et seq.*, and of *California Civil Code* §§ 51, 52(a), 54,

54.1, et seq. On information and belief, this "BIG LOTS STORE #4054" was constructed after 1990 which has subjected the "BIG LOTS STORE #4054" to handicapped access requirements per *California Health & Safety Code* § 19959, and applicable portions of *California Code of Regulations*, Title 24, (the State Building Code).

12. On or about February 12, 2008, Plaintiff, **ANNA ESCOBEDO**, visited the "**BIG LOTS STORE #4054**" in Santa Maria, California for the purpose of making a purchase. Defendants **BIG LOTS STORES, INC., PNS STORES, INC., MIDEB NOMINEES, INC., and DOES ONE TO TEN, inclusive**, interfered with Plaintiff's access to the "**BIG LOTS STORE #4054**" as set forth in Paragraph 4 above.

Said acts and omissions denied Plaintiff legal handicapped access to the "BIG LOTS STORE #4054" according to federal and state law.

- 13. Plaintiff's home, in Santa Maria, California, is approximately 1-1/2 miles from the "**BIG LOTS STORE #4054**," in Santa Maria, California. Plaintiff travels regularly to Santa Maria for pleasure and/or business. Plaintiff intends to return to "**BIG LOTS STORE #4054**" in Santa Maria, California when this public accommodation is made accessible.
- 14. Plaintiff encountered and/or is informed and believes that the following architectural barriers, which violate the requirements of the *California Code of Regulations* Title 24 and *ADAAG*, existed and continue to exist thereby denying Plaintiff and those similarly situated full and equal access to the subject public facility as set forth in Paragraph 4 above.
- 15. Defendants, and each of them, discriminated against Plaintiff **ANNA ESCOBEDO** on the basis of her physical disability, and interfered with her access to the "**BIG LOTS STORE #4054**" establishment, in violation of both California law including, but not limited to, *California Civil Code* §§ 51, 51.5, 54, 54.1, and a violation of Title III, §302, the "Prohibition of Discrimination" provision and §503, the "Prohibition Against Retaliation or Coercion" provision of the *Americans with*

## Disabilities Act of 1990.

16. As a result of the actions and failure to act of defendants, and each of them, and as a result of the failure to provide appropriate accessible parking, proper signage, proper accessible entryways, and accessible accommodations, Plaintiff **ANNA ESCOBEDO** suffered and will suffer a loss of her civil rights to full and equal access to public facilities, and further suffered and will suffer emotional distress, mental distress, mental suffering, mental anguish, which includes shame, humiliation, embarrassment, anger, chagrin, disappointment and worry, expectedly and naturally associated with a person with a physical disability being denied access to a public accommodation, all to her damages as prayed hereinafter in an amount within the jurisdiction of this court.

## I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:

VIOLATION OF *THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990* (42 *USC* §12101 *et seq.*)

- 17. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 16 of this Complaint and incorporates them herein as if separately repled.
- 18. Pursuant to law, in 1990 the United States Congress made findings per 42 USC § 12101 regarding persons with physical disabilities, finding that laws were needed to more fully protect 43 million Americans with one or more physical or mental disabilities; [that] historically society has tended to isolate and segregate individuals with disabilities; [that] such forms of discrimination against individuals with disabilities continue to be a serious and pervasive social problem; [that] the nation's proper goals regarding individuals with disabilities are to assure equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency for such individuals; [and that] the continuing existence of unfair and unnecessary discrimination and prejudice denies people with disabilities the opportunity to compete on an equal basis and to pursue those opportunities for which our free society is justifiably famous.
  - 19. Congress stated as its purpose in passing the Americans with Disabilities

## | Act of 1990 (42 USC § 12102):

It is the purpose of this act (1) to provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities; (2) to provide clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards addressing discrimination against individuals with disabilities; (3) to ensure that the Federal government plays a central role in enforcing the standards established in this act on behalf of individuals with disabilities; and (4) to invoke the sweep of Congressional authority, including the power to enforce the 14th Amendment and to regulate commerce, in order to address the major areas of discrimination faced day to day by people with disabilities.

- 20. As part of the *Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990*, Public Law 101-336 (hereinafter the "ADA"), Congress passed "Title III Public Accommodations and Services Operated by Private Entities" (42 *USC* § 12181 *et seq.*). Among the public accommodations identified for purposes of this title were "a bakery, grocery store, clothing store, hardware store, shopping center, or other sales or rental establishment."
  - 21. Pursuant to 42 *USC* § 12182,

"No individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any place of public accommodation by any person who owns, leases (or leases to), or operates a place of public accommodation."

22. Among the general prohibitions against discrimination were included in 42 USC §12182(b)(1)(A)(i):

**Denial of participation**. It shall be discriminatory to subject an individual or class of individuals on the basis of a disability or disabilities of such individual or class, directly, or through contractual, licensing, or other arrangements, to a denial of the opportunity of the individual or class to

participate in or benefit from the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of an entity.

23. Among the general prohibitions against discrimination were included in 42 USC §12182(b)(1)(E):

**Association** -- It shall be discriminatory to exclude or otherwise deny equal goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, accommodations, or other opportunities to an individual or entity because of the known disability of an individual with whom the individual or entity is known to have a relationship or association.

The acts of defendants set forth herein were a violation of Plaintiff's rights under the ADA, Public Law 101-336, and the regulations promulgated thereunder, 28 *CFR* Part 36 et seq.

24. Among the general prohibitions against discrimination were included in 42 *USC* § 12182(b)(2)(A)(i) and 42 *USC* § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii):

**Discrimination.** For purposes of subsection (a), discrimination includes -

- (i) the imposition or application of eligibility criteria that screen out or tend to screen out an individual with a disability or any class of individuals with disabilities from fully and equally enjoying any goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations, unless such criteria can be shown to be necessary for the provision of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations being offered;
- (ii) a failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the entity can demonstrate that making such modifications would fundamentally alter the nature of such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations.

- 25. Plaintiff alleges that constructing the eligibility requirements, policies, practices and procedure for entry to the "**BIG LOTS STORE** #4054" facility by persons with disabilities and their companions as established by the defendants can be simply modified to eliminate disparate and discriminatory treatment of persons with disabilities by properly constructing barrier free access for safe and full and equal enjoyment of the "**BIG LOTS STORE** #4054" as that enjoyed by other people.
- 26. The specific prohibition against retaliation and coercion is included in the *Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990* § 503(b) and the *Remedies and Procedures* in § 503(c):
  - (b) Interference, Coercion, or Intimidation. It shall be unlawful to coerce, intimidate, threaten, or interfere with any individual in the exercise or enjoyment of, or on account of his or her having exercised or enjoyed, or on account of his or her having aided or encouraged any other individual in the exercise or enjoyment of, any right granted or protected by this Act.
  - (c) Remedies and Procedure. The remedies and procedures available under sections 107, 203, and 308 of this Act shall be available to aggrieved persons for violations of subsections (a) and (b), with respect to Title I, Title II and Title III, respectively.
- USC § 12182(b)(2)(a)(iv), "A failure to remove architectural barriers, and communications barriers that are structural in nature, in existing facilities...where such removal is readily achievable;" and (v) "where and entity can demonstrate that the removal of a barrier under clause (iv) is not readily achievable, a failure to make such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations available through alternative methods if such methods are readily achievable." The acts of Defendants set forth herein were a violations of Plaintiff's rights under the "ADA," Public Law 101-336, and the regulations promulgated thereunder, 28 CFR Part 36, et seq.
  - 28. The removal of the barriers complained of by Plaintiff as hereinabove

5

10

11

13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25 26

27

28

alleged were at all times after 1990 "readily achievable." On information and belief, if the removal of all the barriers complained of here together were not "readily achievable," the removal of each individual barrier complained of herein was "readily achievable."

Per 42 USC § 12181(9), "The term 'readily achievable' means easily 29. accomplishable and able to be carried out without much difficulty or expense." statute and attendant regulations define relative "expense" in relation to the total financial resources of the entities involved, including any "parent" companies. Plaintiff alleges that properly repairing each of the items that Plaintiff complains of herein is readily achievable, including, but not limited to, correcting and repairing the items set forth in Paragraph 4 above.

The changes needed to remove barriers to access for the disabled were and are "readily achievable" by the defendants under standards set forth under 42 USC § 12181 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. (Further, if it was not "readily achievable" for defendants to remove all such barriers, defendants have failed to make the required services available through alternative methods, although such methods are achievable as required by 42 *USC* §12181(b)(2)(a)(iv), (v).)

- Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, §308 (42 USC § 30. 12188 et seq.), Plaintiff is entitled to the remedies and procedures set forth in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 §204(a), (42 USC § 2000a-3(a)), as Plaintiff is being subjected to discrimination on the basis of disability in violation of this title and/or Plaintiff has reasonable grounds for believing that she is about to be subjected to discrimination in violation of Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 §302. Plaintiff cannot return to or make use of the public facilities complained of herein for the purpose of entry and provision of goods and service so long as defendants continue to apply eligibility criteria, policies, practices and procedures to screen out and refuse to allow entry and service to persons with disabilities such as Plaintiff's.
- 31. Defendants', and each of their acts and omissions of failing to provide barrier free handicapped access for Plaintiff, were tantamount to interference, coercion or

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

intimidation pursuant to Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 §503(b) (now 42 USC § 12203):

It shall be unlawful to coerce, intimidate, threaten, or interfere with any individual in the exercise or enjoyment of, or on account of his or her having aided or encouraged any other individual in the exercise or enjoyment of, any right granted or protected by this Act.

- Per Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 § 308(a)(1) (now 42 USC § 12188), "Nothing in this section shall require a person with a disability to engage in a futile gesture if such person has actual notice that a person or organization covered by this title does not intend to comply with its provisions." Pursuant to this last section, Plaintiff, on information and belief, alleges that defendants have continued to violate the law and deny the rights of Plaintiff and other disabled persons to access this public accommodation for the purpose of making a purchase. Therefore, Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief pursuant to §308(a)(2),
  - "... Where appropriate, injunctive relief shall also include requiring the provision of an auxiliary aid or service, modifications of a policy, or provision of alternative methods, to the extent required by this title."
- 33. Plaintiff seeks relief pursuant to remedies set forth in § 204(a) of the *Civil* Rights Act of 1964 (42 USC § 2000a-3(a), and pursuant to federal regulations adopted to implement the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, including, but not limited to, an order granting injunctive relief and attorneys' fees. Such attorneys' fees, "including litigation expenses and costs," are further specifically provided for by §505 of Title III.

#### II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

**BREACH OF** STATUTORY **PROTECTIONS FOR PERSONS** WITH PHYSICAL DISABILITIES (California Health & Safety Code § 19955, et seq.)

Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again 34. herein, the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 31 of this Complaint and incorporate them herein as if separately repled.

4

35. California Health & Safety Code § 19955 provides in pertinent part:

The purpose of this part is to insure that public accommodations or facilities constructed in this state with private funds adhere to the provisions of Chapter 7 (commencing with Sec. 4450) of Division 5 of Title 1 of the *Government Code*. For the purposes of this part "public accommodation or facilities" means a building, structure, facility, complex, or improved area which is used by the general public and shall include auditoriums, hospitals, theaters, restaurants, hotels, motels, stadiums, and convention centers. When sanitary facilities are made available for the public, clients or employees in such accommodations or facilities, they shall be made available for the handicapped.

- 36. California Health & Safety Code § 19956, which appears in the same chapter as §19955, provides in pertinent part, "accommodations constructed in this state shall conform to the provisions of Chapter 7 (commencing with Sec. 4450) of Division 5 of Title 1 of the Government Code..." California Health & Safety Code § 19956 was operative July 1, 1970, and is applicable to all public accommodations constructed or altered after that date. On information and belief, portions of "BIG LOTS STORE #4054" and/or of its buildings, were constructed and/or altered after July 1, 1970, and substantial portions of said building had alterations, structural repairs, and/or additions made to such public accommodations after July 1, 1970, thereby requiring said public accommodations and/or buildings to be subject to the requirements of Part 5.5, California Health & Safety Code § 19955, et seq., upon such alteration, structural repairs or additions per California Health & Safety Code § 19959.
- 37. Pursuant to the authority delegated by *California Government Code* § 4450, *et seq.*, the State Architect promulgated regulations for the enforcement of these provisions. Effective January 1, 1982, Title 24 of the *California Administrative Code* adopted the California State Architect's Regulations and these regulations must be complied with as to any alterations and/or modifications of the "BIG LOTS STORE"

- #4054" occurring after that date. Construction changes occurring prior to this date but after July 1, 1970 triggered access requirements pursuant to the "ASA" requirements, the American Standards Association Specifications, A117.1-1961. On information and belief, at the time of the construction and modification of said building, all buildings and facilities covered were required to conform to each of the standards and specifications described in the American Standards Association Specifications and/or those contained in Title 24 of the California Administrative Code, (now known as Title 24, California Code of Regulations.)
- 38. Public facilities, such as "BIG LOTS STORE #4054" are public accommodations or facilities within the meaning of *California Health & Safety Code* § 19955, et seq.
- 39. It is difficult or impossible for persons with physical disabilities who use wheelchairs, canes, walkers and service animals to travel about in public to use stores with the defects set forth in Paragraph 4 above as required by Title 24 of the *California Code of Regulations* and the *Americans with Disabilities Act Access Guidelines* (*ADAAG*). Thus, when public accommodations fail to provide accessible public facilities, persons with physical disabilities are unable to enter and use said facilities, and are denied full and equal access to and use of that facility that is enjoyed by other members of the general public.
- 40. Plaintiff **ANNA ESCOBEDO** and other similarly situated persons with physical disabilities whose physical conditions require the use of wheelchairs, canes, walkers and service animals are unable to use public facilities on a "full and equal" basis unless each such facility is in compliance with the provisions of the *California Health & Safety Code* § 19955, *et seq.* Plaintiff is a member of that portion of the public whose rights are protected by the provisions of *California Health & Safety Code* § 19955, *et seq.*
- 41. The *California Health & Safety Code* was enacted "[t]o ensure that public accommodations or facilities constructed in this state with private funds adhere to the

11

9

12 13

14

16

15

17 18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25 26

27

28

provisions of Chapter 7 (commencing with §4450) of Division 5 of Title 1 of the Government Code." Such public accommodations are defined to include stores.

- 42. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that as of the date of filing this Complaint, Defendants have not made accessible the facilities at the subject store as set forth in Paragraph 4 above.
- 43. Plaintiff ANNA ESCOBEDO is informed and believes, and therefore alleges, that Defendants BIG LOTS STORES, INC., PNS STORES, INC., MIDEB NOMINEES, INC., and DOES ONE TO TEN, inclusive, and each of them, caused the subject buildings constituting "BIG LOTS STORE #4054" to be constructed, altered and maintained in such a manner that persons with physical disabilities were denied full and equal access to, within and throughout said buildings and were denied full and equal use of said public facilities, and despite knowledge and actual and constructive notice to such Defendants that the configuration of the store and/or buildings was in violation of the civil rights of persons with physical disabilities, such as Plaintiff. Such construction, modification, ownership, operation, maintenance and practices of such public facilities are in violation of law as stated in Part 5.5, California Health & Safety Code § 19955, et seq., and elsewhere in the laws of California.
- 44. On information and belief, the subject building constituting the public facilities of "BIG LOTS STORE #4054" denied full and equal access to Plaintiff and other persons with physical disabilities in other respects due to non-compliance with requirement of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations and California Health & **Safety Code** § 19955, et seq.
- 45. The basis of Plaintiff's aforementioned information and belief is the various means upon which Defendants must have acquired such knowledge, including, but not limited to, this lawsuit, other access lawsuits, communications with operators of other stores and other property owners regarding denial access, communications with Plaintiff and other persons with disabilities, communications with other patrons who regularly visit there, communications with owners of other businesses, notices and advisories they

1 | c 2 | t 3 | a 4 | t 5 | w 6 | s

obtained from governmental agencies through the mails, at seminars, posted bulletins, television, radio, public service announcements, or upon modification, improvement, alteration or substantial repair of the subject premises and other properties owned by these Defendants, newspaper articles and trade publications regarding the *Americans* with Disabilities Act of 1990 and other access law, and other similar information. The scope and means of the knowledge of each defendant is within each defendant's exclusive control and cannot be ascertained except through discovery.

- 46. As a result of Defendants' acts and omissions in this regard, Plaintiff has been required to incur legal expenses and hire attorneys in order to enforce her civil rights and enforce provisions of the law protecting access for persons with physical disabilities and prohibiting discrimination against persons with physical disabilities, and to take such action both in her own interests and in order to enforce an important right affecting the public interest. Plaintiff, therefore, seeks damages in this lawsuit for recovery of all reasonable attorneys' fees incurred, pursuant to the provisions of the *California Code of Civil Procedure* § 1021.5. Plaintiff additionally seeks attorneys' fees pursuant to *California Health & Safety Code* § 19953 and *California Civil Code* §§ 54.3 and 55.
- 47. Defendants, and each of them, at times prior to and including February 12, 2008, and continuing to the present time, knew that persons with physical disabilities were denied their rights of equal access to all portions of this public facility. Despite such knowledge, Defendants failed and refused to take steps to comply with the applicable access statutes; and despite knowledge of the resulting problems and denial of civil rights thereby suffered by Plaintiff **ANNA ESCOBEDO** and other similarly situated persons with disabilities, including the specific notices referred to in paragraph 43 of this Complaint. Defendants have failed and refused to take action to grant full and equal access to persons with physical disabilities in the respects complained of hereinabove. Defendants and each of them have carried out a course of conduct of refusing to respond to, or correct complaints about, denial of handicap access.

48. As a result of the actions and failure of Defendants, and each of them, and as a result of the failure to provide proper accessible public facilities, Plaintiff **ANNA ESCOBEDO** was denied her civil rights, including her right to full and equal access to public facilities, was embarrassed and humiliated, suffered physical, psychological and mental injuries and emotional distress, mental distress, mental suffering, mental anguish, which includes shame, humiliation, embarrassment, anger, chagrin, disappointment and worry, expectedly and naturally associated with a person with a physical disability being denied access to a public accommodation.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for damages as hereinafter stated.

## III. THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S CIVIL RIGHTS ACTS (*California Civil Code* §§ 54, 54.1 and 54.3)

- 49. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 48 of this Complaint and incorporates them herein as if separately repled.
- 50. The public facilities above-described constitute public facilities and public accommodations within the meaning of *California Health & Safety Code* § 19955 *et seq.* and were facilities to which members of the public are invited. The aforementioned acts and omissions of defendants, and each of them, constitute a denial of equal access to and use and enjoyment of these facilities by persons with disabilities, including Plaintiff **ANNA ESCOBEDO**. Said acts and omissions are also in violation of provisions of Title 24 of the *California Code of Regulations*.
- 51. The rights of Plaintiff, the entitlement of Plaintiff to full and equal access and the denial by defendants of such rights and entitlements are set forth in *California Civil Code* §§ 54, 54.1 and 54.3, to wit:

Individuals with disabilities shall have the same right as the...general public to full and free use of the streets, highways, sidewalks, walkways, public buildings, public facilities, and other public places. *California Civil* 

**Code** § 54(a).

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Individuals with disabilities shall be entitled to full and equal access, as other members of the general public, to accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of all common carriers, airplanes, motor vehicles, railroad trains, motor buses, streetcars, boats, or any other public conveyances or modes of transportation (whether private, public, franchised, licensed, contracted, or otherwise provided), telephone facilities, adoption agencies, private schools, hotels, lodging places, places of public accommodation, amusement or resort, and other places to which the general public is invited, subject only to the conditions and limitations established by law, or state or federal regulation, and applicable alike to all persons. *California Civil Code* § 54.1(a).

- 52. On or about February 12, 2008, Plaintiff **ANNA ESCOBEDO** suffered violations of *California Civil Code* §§ 54 and 54.1 in that she was denied full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities and privileges of said **BIG LOTS STORE** #4054, as set forth in paragraph 4 above. Plaintiff was also denied full and equal access to other particulars, including, but not limited to, those described hereinabove. Plaintiff was also denied use of facilities that she was entitled to under Title III of the *Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990*.
- As a result of the denial of full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, 53. facilities and privileges of defendants' **BIG LOTS STORE** #4054 due to the acts and omissions of defendants, and each of them, in owning, operating, and maintaining this subject public facility, Plaintiff suffered violations of her civil rights, including, but not limited to, rights under California Civil Code §§ 54, 54.1, and 54.3, and has and will suffer physical injury, emotional distress, mental distress, mental suffering, mental humiliation, anguish, which includes shame, embarrassment, chagrin, anger, disappointment and worry, expectedly and naturally associated with a disabled person's denial of full and equal enjoyment of goods, services, privileges, etc., all to her damages

7

13

12

14 15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25

26

27 28 as prayed hereinafter in an amount within the jurisdiction of the court. Defendants' actions and omissions to act constituted discrimination against Plaintiff on the sole basis that Plaintiff was physically disabled.

- 54. Plaintiff seeks damages for the violation of her rights as a disabled person on or about February 12, 2008, according to proof, pursuant to *California Civil Code* § 54.3, including a trebling of all statutory and actual damages, general and special, available pursuant to *California Civil Code* § 54.3(a).
- As a result of defendants' acts and omissions in this regard, Plaintiff ANNA 55. **ESCOBEDO** has been required to incur legal expenses and hire attorneys in order to enforce her rights and enforce provisions of the law protecting the full and equal enjoyment of goods, services, facilities, privileges of public facilities by the disabled, and those individuals associated with or accompanied by a person with disabilities, and prohibiting discrimination against the disabled. Plaintiff, therefore, seeks recovery in this lawsuit for all reasonable attorneys' fees incurred pursuant to the provisions of *California* Civil Code § 54.3. Additionally, Plaintiff's lawsuit is intended not only to obtain compensation for damages to Plaintiff, but also to compel the defendants to make their goods, services, facilities and privileges available and accessible to all members of the public with physical disabilities, justifying public interest attorneys' fees pursuant to the provisions of *California Code of Civil Procedure* § 1021.5.
- The acts and omissions of defendants in failing to provide the required 56. accessible facilities subsequent to the enactment date and compliance date of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and refusal to make remedial modifications and alterations to its accessible parking, signage, pathways, and other elements as hereinabove stated, after being notified by patrons before and after the time of Plaintiff's visit, on or about February 12, 2008, and all times prior thereto with the knowledge that persons with disabilities would enter defendants' premises, the reason given therefor, was an established policy, practice and procedure of refusing and denying entry, thereby denying services to a person with disabilities and the companions thereof, evidence

45

6

789

10 11

12

131415

18

16

17

20

19

22

21

2324

25

2627

2728

malice and oppression toward Plaintiff and other disabled persons.

- 57. Defendants have failed to establish a nondiscriminatory criteria, policy, practice and procedure for entry into said "BIG LOTS STORE #4054" as hereinabove described.
- 58. As a result of defendants' continuing failure to provide for the full and equal enjoyment of goods, services, facilities and privileges of said "BIG LOTS STORE #4054" as hereinabove described, Plaintiff has continually been denied her rights to full and equal enjoyment of the subject store, as it would be a "futile gesture" to attempt to patronize said "BIG LOTS STORE #4054" with the discriminatory policy in place as hereinabove described.
- 59. The acts and omissions of defendants as complained of herein in failing to provide the required accessible facilities subsequent to the enactment date and compliance date of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and refusal to make remedial modifications and alternations to the architectural barriers as stated herein and in failing to establish practices, policies and procedures to allow safe access by persons who are disabled are continuing on a day-to-day basis to have the effect of wrongfully and willfully excluding Plaintiff and other members of the public who are physically disabled, from full and equal enjoyment of the subject "BIG LOTS STORE #4054" as hereinabove described. Such acts and omissions are the continuing cause of humiliation and mental and emotional suffering of Plaintiff in that these actions continue to treat Plaintiff as an inferior and second class citizen and serve to discriminate against her on the sole basis that she is a physically disabled. Plaintiff is unable, so long as such acts and omissions of defendants continue, to achieve full and equal enjoyment of the goods and services of said "BIG LOTS STORE #4054" as described hereinabove. The acts of defendants have legally caused and will continue to cause irreparable injury to Plaintiff if not enjoined by this court.
- 60. Wherefore, Plaintiff asks this court to preliminarily and permanently enjoin any continuing refusal by defendants to permit entry to said "BIG LOTS STORE

5

6 7

8 9

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17 18

19 20

22

21

23 24

25 26

27

28

#4054" and to serve Plaintiff or others similarly situated, and to require defendants to comply forthwith with the applicable statutory requirements relating to the full and equal enjoyment of goods and services as described hereinabove for disabled persons. Such injunctive relief is provided by California Civil Code § 55. Plaintiff further requests that the court award statutory costs and attorneys' fees to Plaintiff pursuant to California Civil Code § 55 and California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, all as hereinafter prayed for.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for compensatory damages, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as allowed by statute and according to proof.

#### IV. FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATIONS OF UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT (California Civil Code §§ 51 and 51.5)

- 59. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 58 of this Complaint and incorporates them herein as if separately repled.
- 60. Defendants' acts and omissions as specified with regard to discriminatory treatment of Plaintiff ANNA ESCOBEDO on the basis of her physical disabilities, have been in violation of California Civil Code §§ 51 and 51.5, the Unruh Civil Rights Act, and have denied to Plaintiff her rights to "full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges or services in all business establishments of every kind whatsoever."
- 61. California Civil Code § 51 also provides that "[a] violation of the right of any individual under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-336) shall also constitute a violation of this section."
- 62. California Civil Code § 51.5 also provides that "[n]o business establishment of any kind whatsoever shall discriminate against, boycott, or blacklist, refuse to buy from, sell to, or trade with any person in this state because of the race, creed, religion, color, national origin, sex, disability of the person or of the person's partners, members,

4

5

6

8

7

9 10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

stockholders, directors, officers, managers, superintendents, agents, employees, business associates, suppliers, or customers."

63. As a result of the violation of Plaintiff's civil rights protected by *California* Civil Code §§ 51 and, 51.5, Plaintiff is entitled to the rights and remedies of California Civil Code § 52, including a trebling of actual damages (defined by California Civil **Code** § 52(h) to mean "special and general damages"), as well as reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, as allowed by statute, according to proof.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this court award damages and provide relief as follows:

## PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff prays that this court award damages and provide relief as follows:

- Grant injunctive relief requiring that defendants establish a non-1. discriminatory criteria policy, practice and procedure permitting entry into the BIG **LOTS STORE #4054** in Santa Maria, California, for the purpose of obtaining the goods and services accorded therein according to California Civil Code §§ 51, 51.5, 52, 54, 54.1, 54.3, et seq., and Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and grant injunctive relief requiring that Defendants repair and render safe to disabled persons, and otherwise make accessible, all public areas of the store, including, but not limited to, all barriers to access set forth in Paragraph 4 of this Complaint, and to make all such facilities "readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities," according to the standards of Title 24 of the California Administrative Code, California Health & Safety Code § 19955 et seq., and Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the standards of ADAAG; and prohibiting operation of the BIG LOTS STORE #4054, located in Santa Maria, California, as a public facility until Defendants provide full and equal enjoyment of goods and services as described hereinabove to physically disabled persons, including Plaintiff;
  - 2. General damages according to proof;
  - Statutory and "actual" damages, including general damages and special 3.

1	damages, according to proof, pursuant to California Civil Code §§ 52, and 54.3, and that					
2	these damages be <u>trebled</u> ;					
3	4.	. Prejudgment interest on all compensatory damages;				
4	5.	Remedies and Procedures available under Americans with Disabilities Act				
5	of 1990 §§ 107, 203 and 308;					
6	6.	Award Plaintiff all litigation expenses, all costs of this proceeding and all				
7	reasonable	ble attorneys' fees as provided by law, including, but not limited to, those				
8	recoverable pursuant to the provisions of <i>California Civil Code</i> §§ 52, 54.3, and 55,					
9	California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, and Americans with Disabilities Act of					
10	1990 §308 of Title III; and					
11	7.	7. Grant such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.				
12			SINGLETON LAW GROUP			
13						
14	Dated:	March 14, 2008	/s/ Richard E. Grabowski			
15			Richard E. Grabowski, Jason K. Singleton, Attorneys for			
16			Plaintiff, ANNA ESCOBEDO			
17						
18	REQUEST FOR JURY TRIAL					
19	Plaintiffs hereby request a jury for all claims for which a jury is permitted.					
20			SINGLETON LAW GROUP			
21						
22	Dated:	March 14, 2008	/s/ Richard E. Grabowski Richard E. Grabowski,			
23			Jason K. Singleton, Attorneys for			
24			Plaintiff, ANNA ESCOBEDO			
25						
26						
27						
28						

## Case 3:08-cv-01439-WHA Document 1-2 Filed 03/13/2008 Page 1 of 2 UNITED STA GOISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRIC CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

	if you are representing yourself [	۵)	DEFENDANTS BIG LOTS STORES, INC., an Ohio corporation, dba BIG LOTS STORE #4054, PNS STORES, INC., a California corporation, MIDEB					
ANNA ESCOBEDO			NOMINEES, INC., a No					
(b), County of Residence of First	t Listed Plaintiff (Except in U.S. I	Plaintiff Cases):	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (In U.S. Plaintiff Cases Only):					
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Adv yourself, provide same.)	dress and Telephone Number. If y	ou are representing	Attorneys (If Known)					
SINGLETON LAW GI	ROUP 707-441-1177							
611 L Street, Suite A								
Eureka, CA 95501								
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION	N (Place an X in one box only.)		SHIP OF PRINCIPAL PART X in one box for plaintiff and or		Only			
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S.		PTF	DEF	PTF DEF			
	Government Not a Party)	Citizen of This	s State 🔲 1	☐ 1 Incorporated or Pr of Business in this				
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	t			of Business in An				
		Citizen or Sub	ject of a Foreign Country 3	3 Foreign Nation	□6 □6			
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in on	e box only.)							
☑ 1 Original □ 2 Remove	ed from 3 Remanded from 1	☐ 4 Reinstated or □	5 Transferred from another dis					
Proceeding State Co	• •	Reopened		Distri Litiga				
V. REQUESTED IN COMPL	AINT: JURY DEMAND: 🗹							
CLASS ACTION under F.R.C	.P. 23: ☐ Yes ☐ No	<b>5</b>	MONEY DEMANDED IN C	OMPLAINT: 5 accordin	ig to proof			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cit	e the U.S. Civil Statute under whi	ch you are filing and v	write a brief statement of cause.	Do not cite jurisdictional s	tatutes unless diversity.)			
28 USC §1331, Violation	ons of the Americans With Di	sabilities Act of 199	0 (42 USC §12101, et seq.)					
		<u> </u>		<del></del>				
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place		ı		1	<u></u>			
A Agendary Assession &	CONFRAGIES	SANDARY	THE REAL PROPERTY AND ADDRESS OF THE PERSON	PRISONER	2.2.000			
☐ 400 State Reapportionment	110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJU	RY. PERSONAL PROPERTY	SPECTIONS 350	☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act			
☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking	☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Proc	and the second s	Vacate Sentence	☐ 720 Labor/Mgmt.			
☐ 450 Commerce/ICC	☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	Liability	☐ 371 Truth in Lending		Relations			
Rates/etc.	☐ 150 Recovery of	320 Assault, Libe	1 & □ 380 Other Personal	☐ 530 General ☐ 535 Death Penalty	730 Labor/Mgmt.			
☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced	Overpayment & Enforcement of	Slander ☐ 330 Fed, Employe			Reporting & Disclosure Act			
and Corrupt	Judgment	Liability	Product Liability	Other	☐ 740 Railway Labor Act			
Organizations	☐ 151 Medicare Act	☐ 340 Marine	BARLARAJAYOV		☐ 790 Other Labor			
480 Consumer Credit	152 Recovery of Defaulted	345 Marine Produ	act	☐ 555 Prison Condition	Litigation  ☐ 791 Empl. Ret. Inc.			
☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV ☐ 810 Selective Service	Student Loan (Excl. Veterans)	Liability ☐ 350 Motor Vehic		( x ) 2π (Λ( (n) + - 4)	Security Act			
☐ 850 Securities/Commodities		☐ 355 Motor Vehic	le USC 157	☐ 610 Agriculture	@PROPERTY RIGHTS			
/Exchange	Overpayment of	Product Liab ☐ 360 Other Person		☐ 620 Other Food & Drug	☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 830 Patent			
☐ 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410	Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits	Injury	□ 442 Employment	☐ 625 Drug Related	□ 840 Trademark			
☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions	☐ 190 Other Contract	☐ 362 Personal Inju		Seizure of	TO SECOND PROPERTY OF THE PARTY			
☐ 891 Agricultural Act	☐ 195 Contract Product	Med Malpra			□ 861 HIA (1395ff)			
☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Act	Liability ☐ 196 Franchise	☐ 365 Personal Inju Product Liab		881  630 Liquor Laws	□ 862 Black Lung (923)  □ 863 DIWC/DIWW			
☐ 893 Environmental Matters	REALEROPERING	☐ 368 Asbestos Per	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	☐ 640 R.R. & Truck	(405(g))			
☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act	☐ 210 Land Condemnation	Injury Produ		650 Airline Regs	☐ 864 SSID Title XVI			
□ 895 Freedom of Info. Act	☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	Liability	446 American with Disabilities -	☐ 660 Occupational Safety /Health	□ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAD TAX SUITS:			
☐ 900 Appeal of Fee Determi- nation Under Equal	240 Torts to Land	1	Other	690 Other	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff			
Access to Justice	☐ 245 Tort Product Liability		☐ 440 Other Civil		or Defendant)			
☐ 950 Constitutionality of	☐ 290 All Other Real Property		Rights		☐ 871 IRS-Third Party 26 USC 7609			
State Statutes  VIII(a) IDENTICAL CASES	Has this action been previously	filed and dismissed re	emanded or closed? M No 🗆	Yes	030 1007			
VIII(a). IDENTICAL CASES: Has this action been previously filed and dismissed, remanded or closed? ☑ No ☐ Yes  If yes, list case number(s):								
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Number:								
	CASE INCHIDEL.			<del></del>				

## Case 3:08-cy-01439-WHA Document 1-2 Filed 03/13/2008 Page 2 of 2 UNITED ST. DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRIC CALIFORNIA

## AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

VIII(b). RELATED CASES:	Have any cases been pre	eviously filed that are related to the present case? WNo Yes				
If yes, list case number(s):	<del></del>					
(Check all boxes that apply) [	il cases are deemed related if a previously filed case and the present case:  eck all boxes that apply)  A. Arise from the same or closely related transactions, happenings, or events; or  B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or  C. For other reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or  D. Involve the same patent, trademark or copyright, and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.					
IX. VENUE: List the Californi  Check here if the U.S. govern	a County, or State if other	r than California, in which EACH named plaintiff resides (Use an additional sheet if necessary)				
SANTA BARBARA	,					
List the California County, or S Check here if the U.S. gove PNS - OHIO MIDEB - LOS ANGELI BIG LOTS - OHIO	ernment, its agencies or en	nia, in which EACH named defendant resides. (Use an additional sheet if necessary).  In a named defendant.				
List the California County, or Note: In land condemnation ca SANTA BARBARA		omia, in which EACH claim arose. (Use an additional sheet if necessary) e tract of land involved.				
or other papers as required	s: The CV-71 (JS-44) Ci	ivil Cover Sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings oved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not ripose of statistics, venue and initiating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions				
Key to Statistical codes relating	to Social Security Cases:					
Nature of Suit (		Substantive Statement of Cause of Action				
861	НІА	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))				
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)				
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))				
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))				
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.				
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. (g))				

CIVIL COVER SHEET